



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,152	11/06/2001	William B. Kerfoot	10578-003002	1164

26161 7590 09/10/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 02110

17

EXAMINER

PRINCE, FRED G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1724

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,152

Applicant(s)

KERFOOT, WILLIAM B.

Examiner

Fred Prince

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 41 and 42 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 13, 14, 24-26 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15-23, 27-36, and 43-44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c)

because:

The person who has signed the disclaimer has not stated the extent of his/her interest, or the business entity's interest, in the application/patent. See 37 CFR 1.321(b)(3).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 13-14, 24-26, and 37-40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 12, 19, and 27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,312,605. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the patent claims may be construed broadly enough to encompass the limitations of the instant claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 41-42 are allowed.
5. Claims 15-23, 27-36, 43-44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Per claims 15-23, while claim 13 is not patentable for the reasons provided above, in the examiner's opinion, the combination of claim 13 and any one of claims 15-23 is patentably distinct over the patent claims of US Pat No 6,312, 605 and the prior art fails to teach or fairly suggest the invention of claim 13 in combination with the elements of claims 15-23, respectively. The elements provide the benefit of encouraging degradation of leachate plumes which contain biodegradable organics.

Per claims 27-36 and 43-44, while claim 24 is not patentable for the reasons provided above, in the examiner's opinion, the combination of claim 24 and any one of claims 27-36 is patentably distinct over the patent claims of US Pat No 6,312, 605 and the prior art fails to teach or fairly suggest the invention of claim 24 in combination with the elements of claims 27-36, respectively. The elements provide the benefit of encouraging Criegee decomposition of leachate plumes containing dissolved chlorinated hydrocarbons.

Per claims 41-42, in the examiner's opinion, the prior art fails to teach or fairly suggest the combination microencapsulated ozone and air to promote a Criegee or

Art Unit: 1724

Criegee-like to react ozone with volatile organics in order to decompose the volatile organics while simultaneously terminating a normal reversible Henry's reaction. The combination of elements provides the advantage of destroying organic waste while avoiding vacuum extraction or the release of contaminating vapors.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Prince whose telephone number is (703) 306-9169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:30-4:00; alt. Fridays 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine R. Copenheaver can be reached on (703) 308-1261. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Fred G. Prince
FRED G. PRINCE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9-3-03